

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
HAMMOND DIVISION AT LAFAYETTE**

NANCY ROE,  
Plaintiff,

v.

PURDUE UNIVERSITY, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

CAUSE NO.: 4:18-CV-89-JEM

**VERDICT: Purdue University**

**Question 1 (choose (check) a or b):**

\_\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Plaintiff [REDACTED] with respect to her claim that Defendant Purdue University treated her differently in investigating a complaint of assault because she is female; that it retaliated against her because of her good faith complaint of sexual assault; that it treated Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s claim of assault with indifference during the investigation; or that Defendant Purdue University's method of determining that Plaintiff [REDACTED] should be subject to discipline was the equivalent of an official decision not to take action to remedy student-on-student harassment.

\_\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Defendant Purdue University with respect to all claims brought by the plaintiff [REDACTED].

**(If you check response "b", do not answer Question 2, and sign this verdict form without answering the next question. If you check "a" to the question, then proceed to the next question)**

Question 2

We, the jury, award compensatory damages for the benefit of Plaintiff [REDACTED] to be paid by Defendant Purdue University in the following amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Juror

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
HAMMOND DIVISION AT LAFAYETTE**

NANCY ROE,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CAUSE NO.: 4:18-CV-89-JEM
	)	
PURDUE UNIVERSITY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	

**VERDICT: Katherine Sermersheim**

**Question 1 (choose (check) a or b):**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Plaintiff [REDACTED] with respect to her claim that Defendant Katherine Sermersheim did not provide adequate notice to Plaintiff [REDACTED] of the investigation against her or the opportunity to be fully heard and that the suspension deprived Plaintiff [REDACTED] of her liberty and/or property.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Defendant Katherine Sermersheim with respect to Plaintiff [REDACTED] claim that Defendant Katherine Sermersheim did not provide adequate notice to [REDACTED] of the investigation against her or the opportunity to be fully heard and that the suspension deprived [REDACTED] of her liberty and/or property.

**(Proceed to the next question.)**

**Question 2 (choose (check) a or b)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Plaintiff [REDACTED] with respect to her claim that Defendant Katherine Sermersheim disciplined Plaintiff [REDACTED] because Plaintiff [REDACTED] is a woman.

\_\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Defendant Katherine Sermersheim with respect to Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s claim that Defendant Katherine Sermersheim disciplined Plaintiff [REDACTED] because Plaintiff [REDACTED] is a woman.

**(If you check response “b” to both of the above questions, do not answer Question 3 and sign this verdict form without answering any of the other questions. If you check response “a” to either question, then proceed to Question 3.)**

Question 3

We, the jury, find that Plaintiff [REDACTED] is entitled to compensatory damages from Defendant Katherine Sermersheim in the following amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

**(Proceed to the next question.)**

Question 4 (choose (check) a or b)

\_\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find Defendant Katherine Sermersheim's conduct WAS malicious or in reckless disregard of Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s rights.

\_\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find that Defendant Katherine Sermersheim's conduct WAS NOT malicious or in reckless disregard of Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s rights.

**(If you check response “b”, do not answer Question 5 and sign this verdict form without answering Question 5. If you check response “a” to this question, then proceed to Question 5.)**

Question 5

We, the jury, find that plaintiff [REDACTED] is entitled to punitive damages from Defendant Katherine Sermersheim in the following amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Juror

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
HAMMOND DIVISION AT LAFAYETTE**

NANCY ROE,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CAUSE NO.: 4:18-CV-89-JEM
	)	
PURDUE UNIVERSITY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	

**VERDICT: Alysa Rollock**

**Question 1 (choose (check) a or b):**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of the plaintiff [REDACTED] with respect to her claim that Defendant Alysa Rollock did not provide adequate notice to Plaintiff [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of the investigation against her or the opportunity to be fully heard and that the suspension deprived Plaintiff [REDACTED] of her liberty and/or property.
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Defendant Alysa Rollock with respect to Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s claim that Defendant Alysa Rollock did not provide adequate notice to Plaintiff [REDACTED] of the investigation against her or the opportunity to be fully heard and that the suspension deprived plaintiff [REDACTED] of her liberty and/or property.

**(Proceed to the next question.)**

**Question 2 (choose (check) a or b)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Plaintiff [REDACTED] with respect to her claim that Defendant Alysa Rollock disciplined Plaintiff [REDACTED] because Plaintiff [REDACTED] is a woman.

\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find in favor of Defendant Alysa Rollock with respect to Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s claim that Defendant Alysa Rollock disciplined Plaintiff [REDACTED] because Plaintiff [REDACTED] is a woman.

**(If you check response “b” to both of the above questions, do not answer Question 3 and sign this verdict form without answering any of the other questions. If you check response “a” to either question, then proceed to Question 3.)**

Question 3

We, the jury, find that Plaintiff [REDACTED] is entitled to compensatory damages from Defendant Alysa Rollock in the following amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

**(Proceed to the next question.)**

Question 4 (choose (check) a or b)

\_\_\_\_ a. We, the jury, unanimously find that Defendant Alysa Rollock's conduct WAS malicious or in reckless disregard of Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s rights.

\_\_\_\_ b. We, the jury, unanimously find that Defendant Alysa Rollock's conduct WAS NOT malicious or in reckless disregard of Plaintiff [REDACTED]'s rights.

**(If you check response “b”, do not answer Question 5 and sign this verdict form without answering Question 5. If you check response “a” to this question, then proceed to Question 5.)**

Question 5

We, the jury, find that Plaintiff [REDACTED] is entitled to punitive damages from the

Defendant Alysa Rollock in the following amount: \$ \_\_\_\_\_.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Juror